

**Attachment**  
**National Advisory Group Options**

Option	Description	Meets the Need?	Legal?	Support Resources	Public Access	Relationship with and Impact on Sanctuary Advisory Councils	Other Considerations
A. National Advisory Council	Standing group with permanent membership covering diversity of functions and interests, and meeting regularly (at least twice a year)	Yes; provides a forum for voice of national constituents and user groups and can address issues that go beyond the scope of site-specific sanctuary advisory councils	Yes; NMSP has the legal authority to create such a group under a standard charter	Requires extensive additional support (additional staff (at least 2) + care and feeding of other HQ staff as necessary, travel and logistic resources for every meeting, time invested in communications, pr, presentations, etc; admin steps of FR notices, note taking, meeting prep and follow up, etc.)	Meetings would be open to the public and would provide opportunities for public comment.	Cross-pollination is possible (a couple chairs or members sit on national council). There is a possible perception that it decreases prestige of local Councils. Interaction and relationships among national council, local councils, potentially the council of chairs and NMSP would all need to be worked out.	This group would not be good for giving technical advice on specific issues/problems (although could have working groups that address such). There may also be political concerns such as lobbying, ethics; movers and shakers used to doing lobbying etc.
B. Council on demand	Temporary group composed of the members needed at the time, covering diversity of functions and interest, and meeting annually.	Yes; provides a forum for voice of national constituents and user groups and can address issues that go beyond the scope of site-specific sanctuary advisory councils	Yes; NMSP has the legal authority to create such a group under a standard charter	Less support than a standing advisory group but still requires extensive additional support (additional staff (at least 2) + care and feeding of other HQ staff as necessary, travel and logistic resources for the meeting, time invested in communications, pr, presentations, etc; admin steps of FR notices, note taking, meeting prep and follow up, training annually, filling all seats annually, etc.)	Meetings would be open to the public and would provide opportunities for public comment.	Cross-pollination is possible (a couple chairs or members sit on national council). There is a possible perception that it decreases prestige of local Councils. Interaction and relationships among national council, local councils, potentially the council of chairs and NMSP would all need to be worked out.	This group would not be good for giving technical advice on specific issues/problems (although could have working groups that address such). There may also be political concerns such as lobbying, ethics; movers and shakers used to doing lobbying etc. The membership would also not be current on the NMSP's situation or needs; there is no institutional memory.
C. Small Multiple Advisory Groups	Temporary or permanent small groups specific to projects or functions; membership may be permanent or temporary; meets as needed	Mostly; provides forum for voice of <b>certain</b> national constituent and user groups, and addresses issues and projects that go beyond the scope of site-specific sanctuary advisory councils	Maybe. There may be some legal difficulties with FACA, FOIA, and/or APA. Further legal review needed, especially with regard to how to charter such group(s)	Will require additional support but will vary with needs of each group and will increase as number of groups increase (additional staff + care and feeding from other HQ staff as necessary; travel and logistic resources for every meeting, time invested in communications, pr, presentations, etc; admin steps of FR notices, note taking, meeting prep and follow up, etc.)	Some questions about how and if meetings would be open to the public.	Cross-pollination is possible (a couple chairs or members could sit on smaller groups). There may be some perception that it decreases prestige of local Councils. It is also unknown about the interaction and relationships among national groups, local councils, potentially the council of chairs and NMSP.	This group would be good for giving technical advice on specific issues/problems. There may also be political concerns such as lobbying, ethics; movers and shakers used to doing lobbying etc. There could be a problem with the perception that the NMSP includes some users and excludes others.
D. Council of Chairs (status quo)	Permanent group meeting once a year, with changing membership as Chairs rotate. The NMSP has no say in the make up of the group.	No; does not provide a forum for the voice of national constituents and user groups. It is also difficult to address issues and projects that go beyond the scope of site specific sanctuary advisory councils; there is little or no national experience or perspective.	Yes; NMSP has the legal authority to create such a group under a standard charter	Covered in existing resources but existing council support is being stretched and is about to undergo a review.	Meetings would be open to the public and would provide opportunities for public comment.	The Chairs meeting and advice session would continue. Chairs would continue to represent their councils' positions and views. This enhances the prestige of local Councils.	This group would not be good for giving technical advice on specific issues/problems (although could have working groups that address such). There are questions about the desire of Chairs to continue in this role; about the utility of obtaining site perspectives on national issues (could be gained by simply asking councils to review something); and the desire of the NMSP to obtain national consensus versus simple discussion from each representative.

**Attachment**  
**National Advisory Group Options**

Option	Description	Meets the Need?	Legal?	Support Resources	Public Access	Relationship with and Impact on Sanctuary Advisory Councils	Other Considerations
E. Council of Chairs + other interests	Permanent group meeting once a year, with changing membership as Chairs rotate. The NMSP has no say in the make up of the group but may supplement with other interests or at large members.	Somewhat; provides forum for voice of <b>certain</b> national constituent and user groups, but might not address issues and projects that go beyond the scope of site-specific sanctuary advisory councils. The mix of members would also be difficult; there's no group dynamic.	Yes; NMSP has the legal authority to create such a group under a standard charter	Largely covered by existing resources, but would require additional staff time as well as travel and other costs for additional members	Meetings would be open to the public and would provide opportunities for public comment.	The Chairs meeting and advice session would continue. Chairs would continue to represent their councils' positions and views, and additional members would bring their views to the table. This enhances the prestige of local Councils.	This group would not be good for giving technical advice on specific issues/problems (although could have working groups that address such). There are questions about the desire of Chairs to continue in this role; perhaps same info could be gained by simply asking councils to review something; and the desire of the NMSP to obtain national consensus versus simple discussion from local perspectives. There may also be political concerns such as lobbying, ethics; movers and shakers used to doing lobbying
F. MPA Center Federal Advisory Committee	FACA-chartered advisory group providing advice to the MPA center on general US MPAs. The NMSP has no control over group, membership, meetings, agenda, or advice topics.	Yes, but no. Provides a forum for the voice of national constituents and user groups but not necessarily those of the NMSP. Address issues that go beyond a local scope, but again, are they the issues the NMSP wants to address	Yes; they operate under FACA.	NMSP would be expected to contribute to support the FAC	Meetings are open to the public and provide opportunities for public comment.	There are uncertain impacts on the Chairs meeting, and on the prestige of local councils.	This is generally a bad idea. The NMSP has no control over anything related to this group.
G. Constituent Roundtables	Not really defined as a group and has no set membership; anyone may attend. Meets quarterly or biannually. Staff would present information and then open the floor for discussion and individual comment; no consensus could be obtained.	Yes, mostly. It provides a forum for voice of national constituents and user groups and can address issues that go beyond the scope of site-specific sanctuary advisory councils. However, the NMSP has no control over who would attend. No consensus advice could be obtained	No charter needed as this is not an advisory group. Legality is not an issue if there is no consensus and no permanent members.	Requires additional support (additional staff) + care and feeding of other HQ staff as necessary; time invested in communications, pr, presentations, etc; admin steps of FR notices, note taking, meeting prep and follow up, etc.)	Meetings would be open to the public and would provide opportunities for public comment.	The Chairs meeting would continue. There would be no impact on prestige of local councils.	This group could not be used to obtain consensus advice on specific issues or problems. The NMSP would have little control over who attends. This option would not allow for in depth discussion or consistent, long-term involvement.